

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

OANDA CORPORATION	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Civil Action No. 20-5784 (ZNQ)(DEA)
	:	
v.	:	<b><u>MEMORANDUM ORDER</u></b>
	:	
GAIN CAPITAL HOLDINGS, INC. et al,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
	:	

THIS MATTER comes before the Court on OANDA Corporation’s (“Plaintiff”) Motion to Amend Infringement Contentions pursuant to Local Patent Rule 3.7. ECF Nos. 170 & 171. The Motion having been fully briefed, the Court decides this Motion without oral argument pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 78 and Local Civil Rule 78.1. For the reasons below, the Court **GRANTS** Plaintiff’s Motion.

**I. Background and Procedural History**

Plaintiff is the owner, by assignment, of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,146,336 (the ’336 Patent) and 8,392,311 (the ’311 Patent). Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint (“FAC”), filed on April 20, 2021, alleges that Defendants have infringed one or more claims of the Patents by making, using, selling, offering for sale, or selling products and/or services, and that GAIN has made, used, sold, and offered for sale infringing instrumentalities at <https://forex.com>, and Holdings has used those infringing instrumentalities, including the application programming interfaces (“APIs”), to operate automated infringing trading systems.

A. Plaintiff’s Arguments in Support of the Motion to Amend

In making this Motion, Plaintiff seeks to “provide additional detail and citations to Defendant GAIN’s technical documents supporting OANDA’s already-disclosed infringement theories, as well as to eliminate some of the alleged patent claims.” ECF No. 171 at 4. Plaintiff believes good cause exists because of Defendants’ recent production of technical documents that were produced in April of 2023. *Id.* Plaintiff argues its Motion cannot be opposed on diligence grounds where “[i]mmediately following the Court’s [January 9, 2023] ruling, the parties continued their meet-and-confer efforts concerning GAIN’s technical production” and “GAIN’s story that it had produced substantially complete technical documents about the accused products unraveled.” *Id.*

Plaintiff also anticipates two further arguments by Defendants that Plaintiff fails to establish its diligence. First, Plaintiff addresses the point that Plaintiff should have done more to make Defendant comply with discovery obligations. *Id.* at 6. Plaintiff counters that Defendant should not profit from its own failures and regardless, Plaintiff “has been diligently attempting to push Gain to meet its discovery obligations” for documents requested more than a year ago from the date of the Motion. *Id.* Second, Plaintiff addresses the point that Plaintiff should have sought to amend its infringement contentions in November of 2021, when it received the initial source code and technical information. *Id.* Plaintiff counters that this argument should be rejected because the source code and technical documents received in November of 2021 “did not provide it with sufficient information to understand GAIN’s backend systems and thereby meaningfully amend its contentions.” *Id.*

Plaintiff concludes that the Defendants would not be prejudiced if these proposed amendments are permitted because the case is “in many ways in its early stages.” *Id.* at 6.

B. Defendants’ Arguments Opposing the Motion to Amend

Defendants, writing jointly, oppose this Motion chiefly because Plaintiff's proposed amendments rely upon information that Defendants' assert Plaintiff has long had access to. ECF No. 179 at 5. Thus, Defendants argue that Plaintiff "cannot show that it acted in a timely manner and with diligence to amend its infringement contentions." *Id.* To support this contention, Defendants explain that Plaintiff created a record of discovery disputes to "falsely blame its delay on others." *Id.* at 6. Defendants note that to "avoid burdening this Court with continuous motion practice, GAIN cooperated with OANDA" and produced documents in 2023 even though "GAIN maintained that such documents were either (a) irrelevant or (b) duplicative and cumulative of what OANDA already possessed." *Id.* Defendants conclude on the issue of diligence:

What is now clear is that OANDA merely engaged in a litigation strategy to pursue a never-ending document demand so that it could create the false appearance that GAIN delayed discovery. Indeed, OANDA did not identify a single document in its Motion that it allegedly "discovered" that was "necessary" to understand anything about GAIN's previously produced documents.

*Id.*

Further, Defendants note while the Court should not even reach the issue of prejudice because Plaintiff's request is untimely and not diligently made, that Defendants would nevertheless be prejudiced by the proposed amended contentions for a couple of reasons. *Id.* at 6. First, Defendants argue Plaintiff's failure to timely and diligently amend its contentions resulted in Defendants being "forced [] to expend resources on two years of broad discovery inquests." *Id.* Second, Defendants argue they are prejudiced because they have "had to complete all of claim construction blind – without knowing [Plaintiff's] theories." Third, Defendants argue they have been prejudiced by Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Local Civil Rules and its failure to "provide the required notice of its infringement allegations." *Id.* at 6-7.

C. Plaintiff's Reply

Plaintiff concedes that the proposed amended infringement contentions “do not change (and in fact narrow) the infringement theories” of the case. ECF No. 184 at 4. Plaintiff reiterates that the Defendants’ prior productions were “inadequate to explain the design and operation of GAIN’s FX trading platform or to understand GAIN’s source code.” *Id.* Due to these suggested inadequacies, Plaintiff expounds that it spent the year of 2022 propounding additional discovery. *Id.*

Plaintiff argues that the April 2023 production made by GAIN cannot be seen as “cumulative and irrelevant”<sup>1</sup> because the new production “contained countless new architectural diagrams and flowcharts of direct relevant to the design and operation of the accused product.” *Id.* at 5. Plaintiff further refutes Defendants’ allegation that Plaintiff does not in fact rely upon any of the new discovery by explaining that:

contrary to GAIN’s claim, the fact that the amendments do not *only* include citations to the new material, but also citations to some public documents, some documents that were produced in 2021, and some source code does not mean the same amendments could have been made in the absence of the 180,000+-page Confluence production.

ECF No. 184 at 5. In sum, “GAIN’s belated Confluence production not only provided OANDA with new pieces of the puzzle, but also explained how they connected to the pieces OANDA already had.” *Id.*

With regards to prejudice, Plaintiff replies that “the claim that OANDA not amending its contentions earlier caused discovery disputes gets things backwards: GAIN baselessly withheld discovery, preventing OANDA from providing the amended contentions that GAIN professed to want.” *Id.* at 14. Additionally, Plaintiff argues the prejudice highlighted by Defendants based on

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff takes note of Defendants’ complaint that Plaintiff is relying on the whole Confluence production by tacking on “e.g.” Plaintiff stipulates, in response to this complaint, that its contentions rely upon the specific documents cited, absent further amendment. ECF No. 184 at 15.

alleged noncompliance with L. Pat. R. 3.1 “misses the mark” because “OANDA’s amended contentions do what Rule 3.1(c) requires: they provide charts ‘identifying specifically where each limitation of each asserted claim is found within each Accused Instrumentality.’” *Id.*

## II. Discussion

“The Local Patent Rules ‘are designed to require parties to crystallize their theories of the case early in the litigation and to adhere to those theories once they have been disclosed.’” *Aurinia Pharms. Inc. v. Sun Pharm. Indus., Inc.*, 2022 WL 3040950, at \*6 (D.N.J. Aug. 2, 2022). The Rules “seek to balance the right to develop new information in discovery with the need for certainty as to legal theories.” *Nautilus Neurosciences, Inc. v. Wockhardt USA LLC*, 2013 WL 7901901, at \*2 (D.N.J. Jan. 23, 2013). Rule 3.7 provides that “[a]mendment of any contentions ... required to be filed or exchanged pursuant to these Local Patent Rules may be made only by order of the Court upon a timely application and showing of good cause.” L. Pat. R. 3.7.

Applying the Rule, courts have noted that, unlike the liberal standard for amending pleadings under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a), Patent Rule 3.7 implements a “conservative” approach to amending contentions, “designed to prevent the ‘shifting sands’ approach to claim construction.” *King Pharm., Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.*, 2010 WL 2015258 at \*4 (D.N.J. May 20, 2010). “Sufficiently satisfying the elements set forth in Rule 3.7 is not a simple undertaking, and requires the movant to overcome a substantial preference against granting the amendment.” *Nautilus Neurosciences*, 2013 WL 7901901, at \*2.

Under L. Pat. R. 3.7, good cause “considers first whether the moving party was diligent in amending its contentions and then whether the non-moving party would suffer prejudice if the motion to amend were granted.” *Takeda Pharm. Co. Ltd. v. Sun Pharma Glob. FZE*, 2016 WL 9229318, at \*3 (D.N.J. May 16, 2016). Moreover, a party must not only prove that it was diligent

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.